

THE CANDID EXAMINER.

"EXAMINE YOURSELVES, WHETHER YE BE IN THE FAITH ; PROVE YOUR OWN SELVES."—Paul.

VOL. 2.]

MONTROSE, PA. OCT. 23, 1826.

[NO. 10.]

For the Candid Examiner.

No. IX.

Examiner Observed.—A rejoinder, &c.

We shall devote our remarks in this No. to the subject of *conditions*. On this subject we explained our views in the third part of our 2d number, which the reader is requested to turn to and examine.

The Editor, in his reply on this subject, rather than confront the plain scriptures, with the natural and necessary consequences which are drawn from them, seems for the time to yield to their force. He says, "with what is said on this point we agree, yet there may be a dispute whether all will comply," &c. Here he allows that salvation is *conditional*; for in the place to which he alludes, we asserted this unequivocally. Now how well he agrees with what we "said on this point," will be seen in the following taken from page 156, "Why is this new covenant established upon better promises? Because the promises are *not conditional* like the promises of that covenant which was done away. If the blessings of the new covenant are *conditional* how is it established upon better promises?" If salvation is *conditional* as he first concedes, and the *promises* of the new covenant are *not conditional*, as he now asserts, where is this gentleman's consistency? If the Editor can settle the difference with the Editor, we have no objections!! "Whether all will comply," is another enquiry. To this we shall now attend. "All will finally be brought to repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," this "receives very strong support from what Observer has communicated under his second general head, 'Here he not only made it consistent, &c. for men to be saved on certain conditions, but provided efficient means, by giving his spirit to accomplish the work.'" But he is very much mistaken as to deriving any support from what we have said. We said nothing about the holy spirit's *performing conditions* for the sinner, or *irresistably forcing* him to perform them. The work of the spirit is to convince, sanctify, &c. But it is possible for the sinner so to 'resist the Holy Ghost,' as not to be sanctified by his influence!

Again, "With regard to these conditions being antecedent to the possession of the benefit,

we would state that the conditions do not particularly differ from the benefit itself." Not indeed? And is this according to the common sense of mankind? That the terms upon which a benefit is suspended "does not particularly differ from the benefit itself?" A laboring man on the condition of working hard all day, receives a bushel of grain. Now it appears to us that the man would discover a *particular* difference between the *condition* and the *benefit* itself. And if the Editor cannot discover the difference otherwise, let him once make the experiment, and see what the result would be! But perhaps he would make it out, "as far as a person repents by breaking off his sins," &c. "so far he is saved." But salvation may be the immediate consequence of repentance, and still be "*particularly different*" from it! Again, "If it is held forth that holiness is a condition of salvation, it is also held forth that holiness is salvation." If our Examiner can find any place in the Bible where holiness is "set forth," as the condition of salvation, and as salvation itself, in the same sense, his singular notions would derive some support from such a plan. We should hardly have said so much upon some of these *crude effusions* of our friend, but that he has thought them of so much importance to his theory, as to repeat them! (In p. 155.)

We pass now to consider that part of his reply to our 3d number, which relates to *conditions*. He says, p. 155, "what are generally called the important conditions of salvation, are performed by God." Does he believe that those conditions which we have shown to be required of men, (p. 137.) are *unimportant*? If not, they must be performed by God." And if the conditions of *repentance* and *faith* are "performed by God," would it not be as preposterous to require them of man as to require him to do any other of God's *peculiar works*? Can any reason be given why he is to be damned for not doing God's works? If so we would be obliged to this gentleman to favor us with it; for we confess that we cannot conceive of any! Again, he says "our salvation from beginning to end is all of God." If he intends by this to assert that the conditions are *all* performed by God, we dissent!

We will now notice the scriptures which he alleges in support of his doctrine, "— unto

you first God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts 3. 25, 26. Those who contend for conditions to be performed by man, support that we must of ourselves turn from our iniquities." Whoever holds that "we must of ourselves," [by which we suppose is meant without the help of God] "turn from our iniquities" this is by no means our sentiment. And this the Editor must very well know. After what we had written on the influences and offices of the spirit, he could not be mistaken as to our views on this subject! He continues "Peter does not say, God sent Jesus to bless you if you will turn from your iniquities, but God sent him to bless you by turning every one of you from his iniquities." Indeed the passage by no means necessarily implies that Jesus will turn us from our iniquities. But without the least violation of the language, the words may be paraphrased thus, 'God sent his son to bless you with forgiveness of sin, on conditions of your 'turning every one of you from his iniquities,' this meaning accords perfectly with the apostle's language in the 19th verse, 'Repent ye therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the Lord.' Here, all that we contend for is expressed. But if it be necessary more fully to prove that we have something to do in turning to God, we will produce a few passages of the many, which might be quoted. "Turn ye unto him, from whom the children of Israel have revolted." "If they will hearken, and turn every man from his evil way," But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep my statutes" &c. "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die?" But showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God and do works meet for repentance.' 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' [Isa. 31. 6. Jer. 26, 3. Ezek. 18. 21.—33. 11. Acts 26. 20. Mat. 3. 2.] Were we to quote all the passages which go to prove directly or indirectly, that the co-operation of our agency is necessary in our salvation, we should transcribe a great part of the Bible. That God is sometimes said to turn men to him we will admit. But we are to understand by this that he gives them power,—furnishes them with motives—draws them by his spirit—calls and admonishes them, to turn from their sins to himself. And not that he turns them as water power turns a wheel, or as I turn my pen. This would be to destroy the agency of man, and consequently the morality of his actions.

Again, "But now hath he," Jesus "obtained a more excellent ministry by how much he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises; why is the new covenant established upon better promises? because the promises are not conditional," &c. In answer to this we observe, 1. This reason is not founded in fact. We trust that we have made appear that there are conditions in the new or gospel covenant, and indeed he has once acknowledged it. (in p. 140.) 2. A much more consistent and the true reason is, that it gives better terms. It accepts of penitence and faith instead of perfect and unsinning obedience. It promises better things. The old covenant promised earthly things, the new heavenly.

But finally he gives us his favorite passage, "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, 'I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.'" "Israel and Judah stand here for the true people or church of God." Benson. [see Gal. 7. 16.] And these, it is taken for granted, had fulfilled, and would continue to fulfil the conditions. But "the faithfulness of God is engaged in the performance of the new covenant." His part of it only! "I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people," these are the two grand conditions by which the parties in this covenant are bound. 1. 'I will be your God.' As the object of religious adoration to any man, is that being from whom he expects light, direction, defence, support and happiness; so, God, promising to be their God, promises in effect, to give them all these great and good things. 2. 'Ye shall be my people,' implies that they should give God their whole hearts, serve him with all their light and strength, and have no other object of worship and dependance but himself. Any of these conditions broken, the covenant is rendered null and void, and the other party absolved from his engagement.' Dr. Clarke. So, the passage upon which so much stress is laid is nothing against conditions. Though they are not so clearly expressed, they are certainly implied!

He goes on to remark "It is a pity that God's will is so shackled with conditions and contingencies, that it never can be accomplished." Answer. *Contingencies*, is a word which we have not used; and as to conditions, it never was the will of God to save all, without them! Again, "We will use a better term than violate, and say that God may change the nature of man in order to save him." Answer. But he must change it in a way not to violate it! He proceeds "Paul said, 'We look for the Saviour

the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body,"—"according to the working, whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself." Answer. Christ's *changing our vile body*, or *subduing all things*, does not imply the *conversion of all men*, much less does it imply that salvation is *unconditional*! This passage refers to the resurrection, and has nothing to do with the subject under consideration! He thinks if "those who are not in a situation to understand the import of conditions, may be saved unconditionally," it would not be improper to wish that there never had been, nor never would be any but those incapable of understanding the import, and performing those conditions." He may wish that man had been made otherwise than what the God of infinite wisdom saw fit to make him. But perhaps the apostle's reproof would not be misapplied in such a case. "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that *repliest against God*—shall the *thing formed* say unto him that *formed it*, *why hast thou made me thus*?" He continues, "shall we conclude that God by raising up prophets, and preachers to instruct us in the way of salvation, and by giving us powers of intellect to understand it, will effect the endless damnation of many?" It is the abuse of these mercies which effects "the endless damnation of" any, it is by no means to be laid to God's charge! He proceeds, "and will the works of his goodness eventuate in greater evil than good?" That "the works of God's goodness" are so abused as to "eventuate in evil," is a fact which comes under every day's observation. How often are those blessings which were designed to serve the purposes of human happiness, made the instruments of the greatest human misery? And this misery is in general, proportionate to the amount of mercies abused!—And may not sinners 'turn the grace of God into lasciviousness,' 'treasure up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath,' by 'rejecting the council of God against themselves;' and so the word which was designed for their *salvation*, be 'a saviour of death unto death' unto them? Certainly all this is plain, both from experience and the word of God! But as to "the work of God's goodness eventuating in greater evil than good," if it be intended to apply universally, it is a consequence which we disclaim, and which never can fairly be drawn from any thing we have advanced. But if it be intended to apply *only*, to the individual person who abuses goodness, then it may be acknowledged that the *evil* which flows from the *abuse of these mercies* is *greater* than the *good* which he would have received, by a faithful improvement of it.

OBSERVER.

REPLY.

Our rejoinder supposes we have involved ourselves in an inconsistency, because we assented to certain ideas he advanced, concerning what he called conditions of salvation, and also conceded that the salvation of God was suspended on conditions to be performed by men. We agreed with what observer said on this point from the fact that he had just before given us to understand that what he called conditions was wrought in man by the Holy Spirit. These were his words, "When Christ ascended to heaven he sent the holy spirit, to convict, sanctify, comfort and direct us. Herein he not only made it consistent, &c. for man to be saved on certain conditions, but provided efficient means, by giving his spirit to accomplish the gracious work." We could derive no idea from the above, than that the gracious work to be accomplished by the Holy spirit, was the conviction, conversion and sanctification of man: and as Observer was pleased to call this gracious work to be accomplished by the efficient means provided, conditions, we did not feel disposed to enter into a war of words with him on the subject, as the meaning of the thing was of more consequence with us than terms. If there is any difference between us on this subject, the difference is as follows. We believe that conviction, repentance, &c. are wrought in the soul through the influence of the spirit of God, which Observer calls the efficient means provided. Observer believes they are not, or else we are agreed. What his real belief is on this point, or whether he has a steady belief, is difficult to decide. From his various statements, the conclusion would sometimes be drawn, that the work of grace in the heart is performed by God; other times, that this work is performed by man, and at others, that part is of God and part of man. It is generally believed that conviction is the beginning of a work of grace, and Observer says that the holy spirit was sent to convict. Repentance is also a work of grace, and it is written, that the "goodness of God leadeth us to repentance," by which we learn that God is the moving cause of repentance. Peter also testified that "him, (that is Christ) hath God exalted with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Thus repentance is a gift. On a former remark that the conditions do not particularly differ from the benefit itself, Observer thought to disprove by introducing a comparison of a "laboring man on the condition of working hard all day, receives a bushel of grain. Now it appears to us that the man would discover a particular difference between the *condition* and the *benefit*."

itself. In this comparison two ideas are advanced worthy of notice. First, that there is as particular a difference between repentance, &c. (which Observer calls conditions of salvation) and salvation itself as between a man's working hard all day and the wages he receives as his hire. Secondly, that salvation is as much suspended on the works of the creature as the wages of an hireling are on his labors. If Observer is not disposed to abide the consequences of his representing the great salvation of God and the conditions on which it is suspended by a hard days work and a bushel of grain for its reward, he can withdraw his comparison. But to return to the main point in dispute; we quoted the following in proof that God through Christ changes the heart and turns sinners from their iniquities. "Unto you first God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities." Observer introduces the following as the meaning of St. Peter: "God sent his son to bless you, with forgiveness of sins, on condition of your turning every one of you from his iniquities." The language of St. Peter certainly does not carry any such idea, and if Peter did not mean as he said, why did he not say as he meant. Also where does Observer derive his authority to say that Peter meant directly different from what he said. Peter said God sent Christ "to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Observer says "God sent his son to bless you, &c. on condition of your turning every one of you from his iniquities." Turning them from their iniquities, Peter calls the blessing; but Observer calls it the conditions of the blessing.

Again, we quoted a portion of scripture concerning the first covenant. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah—I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts," &c. To whom was the promise in the new covenant made, and what was the blessing contained in the promise? It was made to Israel and Judah, and the blessing promised was as follows, "I will put my laws into their hearts and write them in their minds." But Observer supports that "Israel and Judah stand here for the true people or church of God—and these, it is taken for granted had fulfilled and would continue to fulfil the conditions." But where is the propriety of the Lord's promising to "the true people, or church of God" who "had fulfilled and would continue to fulfil the conditions," *I will put my laws into their hearts and write them in their minds*; for "the true people, or church of God, already, had the laws of God in their

hearts, and written in their minds. We forbear to pursue our remarks on the strange absurdities which appears to mark the labors of Observer in his attempt to evade the force of these scriptures. Neither is it necessary to enlarge our proof that what are frequently called conditions of salvation such as conviction, conversion, repentance &c. &c. are wrought in the heart by God. Observer says on this subject that God "gives them power, furnishes them with motives—draws them by his spirit—calls and admonishes them, to turn from their sins to himself." We would not deny but that God works by means in operating on the mind, in reclaiming and turning his disobedient children from their iniquities. But the work is his, and Observer also says that he "provided efficient means by giving his spirit to accomplish the gracious work." Paul says "all things are of God who hath reconciled us unto himself" by which we learn that God is the moving and efficient cause of our reconciliation. Notwithstanding Observer has in some of his observations attributed so much of a work of grace to God and to the influence of his holy spirit—yet he has in other remarks placed so much on man's independent agency as renders him capable of damning or saving himself; and to a remark we made on the unfortunate condition in which mankind are created and placed, Observer applies to us the reproof of the apostle. "Nay but O man who art thou that repliest against God—shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" When we suggest the impropriety of the idea that God created a portion of mankind under an irrevocable decree of reprobation the abettors of this system immediately resort to the reproof of Paul "Nay but O man who art thou that repliest against God?" When we make a similar suggestion concerning the impropriety of an opinion that God created men under such circumstances, and placed them in such conditions as will eventuate in as great an evil to a portion of them as calvinism itself, the same resort is sought. Both Observer and calvinists force the reproof of Paul to shield these vulnerable points in their doctrines. Both Observer and calvinists are equally strenuous for the endless damnation of sinners, and all the difference that we can discern between them, is, they want sinners damned in their own way. For our part we cannot see how it is any better to be endlessly miserable according to the doctrine of Observer, then according to the doctrine of calvinism, & we cannot believe that Paul designed, by any thing that he said, to shield these doctrines from the point of truth and reason that pierces them. Our rejoinder ap-

pears determined to make it out that our sentiment supposes that God must violate the nature of man or their agency in order to save him. But he obtains nothing of this from what we have advanced. If we have suggested any thing about violation, it cannot be any thing more than an opinion that God may probably violate the sentiments of Observer in order to save his offspring.

To the Editor of the *Candid Examiner*.

Sir,—It is some time since the following dialogue was committed to paper. It originated in a conversation the writer had with a new convert to the Calvinistic doctrine, and if it is worthy of a place in the *Examiner*, you are welcome to insert it.

This new convert began by telling me he had long been seeking for an *easy religion*, that he had read the works of Ballou and other authors on the subject of the 'Restitution of all things,' but that such a religion would not do. I replied, that I believed it to be the gospel, and frankly acknowledged it to be an *easy religion*. 1st, because it was easily proven. 2d, because it brings to the recipient thereof, peace, consolation, happiness. 3d, Because it prompts the real believer to love the author of it, and all men as his brethren, it fills him with gratitude, thanksgiving and adoration, to his kind and benignant father in heaven.—That when he prays for the salvation of all men, he prays in faith without doubting. 4th. It is an *easy religion* because our Lord Jesus Christ hath expressly said it was so. Mat. xi. 30. "My yoke is easy, and my burthen is light." The opposite term to *easy* must be *uneasy*; if therefore, you have not found an *easy religion*, you must have found (if you have found any religion at all) an *uneasy religion*, and I pray God to preserve me from such a predicament. He then began to talk about the woeful transgression of old father Adam.—But I shall place the remainder in questions and answers, as they arose in the conversation.

Calvinist. Pray sir, tell me in what did the transgression of Adam consist?

Universalist. It consisted in disobedience—in sinning against God's Holy law. Paul says "The law is holy, and the commandment holy just, and good."

Cal. What was the consequence of this transgression of Adam—was it not death?

Uni. It was moral guilt and death to the innocence he was in before he sinned.

Cal. Do you hold, sir, that Adam was subject to natural death prior to his sinning?

Uni. I do—as certainly as he was after he had sinned,—from this plain and self-evident

reason, viz. had he been formed *immortal*, no act of his could have rendered him *mortal*.—Immortality cannot die.

Cal. But, sir, did not Adam's transgression reduce him to a state of *total depravity*—and consequently his whole race yet in his loins?

Uni. No :—There is nothing either in scripture or reason to support such an idea, but every thing to the contrary in both.—There is not a word about *total depravity* within the lids of the Bible; and surely reason cannot find a shadow to support it.—As it relates to the *spirit* it is impossible.

Cal. I am willing to go to the scriptures for evidence on this subject, but in matters of this high import, we have nothing to do with reason.—Why is it said then that "by Adam's fall, we lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of Hell forever"—If total depravity was not the consequence of Adam's transgression?

Uni. The scripture is either founded in reason, and the just propriety of things; or else it has an *unreasonable* foundation, and is no guide to us.—We judge of this by that standard of reason which God hath given his rational creatures, or it might as well have been presented to the brute creation.—Be this as it may—your supposed quotation from scripture "In Adam's fall" &c. is not to be found in the Bible.—It is taken from the creeds of men. And the answer to the very next question in the same creed, clearly and substantially refutes and destroys the preceding, viz. "God having out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer." A moments reflection will lead the weakest mind to discover a palpable contradiction in these two connected questions and answers in the Creed. But hear what Paul says on the subject of Adam's transgression 1 Cor. xv, 22. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Paul does not say—*uneven*, or a part, in Christ shall such an *uneven part* be made alive; but to the extent of the consequences of Adam's transgression, even so extensive shall all be made alive in Christ.

Cal. But was there not a curse pronounced on Adam and Eve when they broke God's Holy law?

Uni. Not any :—The only sentence recorded in scripture history of that transaction is—"In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," except the decision of their judge, after they had transgressed (See 3d chap. Gen. for

the whole verdict.) The whole sentence on both was of a temporal nature—There is not one word respecting misery in a future state of existence—not one word about Hell or eternal misery, or total depravity. Adam and Eve were made subject to vanity—"not willingly but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope."

It is not unreasonable to suppose that the spirits of our first Earthly Parents were grieved at the prospect before them: But hear the consolation their Heavenly Father pours into their wounded souls—he said, although the serpent should bruise their heel, "The seed of the woman should bruise his head"—destroy him of course, for we read of no remedy by which the bruised head of the serpent was ever to be healed; but the wound in the heel, this seed of the woman, viz. Christ, was to heal,—as there is abundance of evidence in the scriptures to prove.—The serpent was cursed, the ground was cursed, but there was no curse pronounced on Adam or Eve.—There was no anathemas such as we hear from men—no vindictive wrath appears in the whole transaction, dooming Adam, or Eve, or their offspring, to endless misery in a world of spirits. Indeed such a sentence would have violated every attribute all denominations of christians are wont to ascribe to Deity.

Cal. Pray, sir, how could such a sentence as you have last mentioned violate the attributes of Deity?—Is it not right to suppose there may be a code of moral conduct for God, that would not be proper, nor could apply to man—That whatever the divine Being ordains or effects, must be right and good, merely because he is the agent—That his sovereignty renders him superior to every other rule but that of his own pleasure? In short, cannot Infinite Power, wisdom, justice, and goodness, do as he pleases?

Uni. God can to be sure do any thing he pleases, but can he please to do any thing contrary to his nature?—It is said, and I believe admitted by all, "That power is a principle or energy capable of producing certain effects; and the power of an intelligent being is the ability of performing some designed effect. And wisdom is understood to have the perception and means of application adapted to the end in view. It implies a knowledge of the relation in which the several parts stand to each other, and the direction of this knowledge to complete a whole—Bounded by a strict line of justice, which is a disposition to render to all what is their due. Justice will never inflict punishment beyond the deserts of the criminal, and

never deprives him of the good to which he has an undoubted claim—the whole being circumscribed by goodness and love which promotes the welfare of others to the utmost extent of power."

If God has all these principles to perfection, can he do violence to them; and have they not exactly the same import when applied to God, as in their application when applied to the characters of men—differing only in degree not in nature. Man is too good—too merciful, to take a club and maul his child to all Eternity, or as long as he lives: Yet there are men *bad enough* to say God will do this—yea! that he had doomed them to eternal misery thousands of years before they had an existence. If any crime merits a *touch of fire and brimstone* it would seem that it belonged to them who give such a horrible character to our kind, merciful and benevolent Father in Heaven.

Cal. But stop, sir, you forget that we are placed here in a finite scale, and are sinning against an Infinite Being, consequently our punishment must be *infinite*—"Is not thy wickedness great? And thy iniquities *Infinite*?" So it was said to Job of old—and why so, if he was not *totally depraved*?

Uni. It is a very strange idea to suppose that a *finite being* can commit an *Infinite sin*—A moment's sober reflection must convince any man, not bound up with prejudice and superstition, that the thing supposed, is impossible. Besides it was a lie told to Job, and denounced as such by the Almighty—See Job xlii. 7. "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said unto Eliphaz, the timnite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends, for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right as my servant Job hath." Consequently the infinity of sin is not proven from the book of Job, and there is not another word on the subject from the beginning of the Bible to the end of the same. But let us question a little further, this idea of *total depravity*, and see if the signification of the terms taken together, do not prove too much for those who contend for this darling hypothesis—and instead of lauding their subjects *agreeably to their wishes*, in never ending misery, whether it will not prove *total annihilation*? Depravity is defined by our Lexicographers to be "*corruption*." The word *total*, signifies "*the whole, all*;" therefore the terms *total depravity*, is literally and physically *total corruption*, and consequently is tantamount to annihilation. The candid, rational mind will acknowledge this conclusion to be a *self evident fact*. That the earthly part of man

is depraved, no one will dispute, but that the whole man is so, there is no evidence either in scripture or reason to induce us to believe. Besides, if true, it would render man not worth saving. A filthy garment may be washed clean, but if *totally filthy* it would be annihilated in the operation. The Lord would not have said to man, "Come now and let us reason together," saith the Lord: Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." The eye of the Lord unquestionably saw some soundness about man, or he would not have made the above declaration, or have sent his son down from heaven to "wash us from our sins." If, according to your idea, it was just that *all* were made liable to misery, death and the pains of hell forever, by the transgression of Adam; where is the justice to be found (except in the breasts of vindictive men) that selects a few out of this number, for salvation through a Redeemer? It is a total violation of every correct idea of the attribute of justice—it destroys the principle of goodness altogether. Love is a chimera, Mercy vengeance, and truth an empty sound.

Cal. Sir, this is what I should call *carnal reasoning*, and has no relation with the scriptures of truth—to the carnal mind it may be difficult, but to the *elect* it amounts to nothing—we have a surer foundation to stand upon.

Uni. Yes, a surer foundation than the scriptures and reason!—The creeds of men, the *Saybrook platform*, if you choose. But, sir, true and natural reasoning is not carnal, it is such as our blessed Redeemer made use of when teaching the people. "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent?" &c. God is the author of nature and of reason, and he hath bound the laws of the one, by the other; and in reasoning in this connection, is reasoning from what we know, and is not carnal, but Godly. Shall man be placed in the same scale with the brute creation, whose pursuits commence and cease with animal gratification? Never. Reason carries man beyond the bounds of this life, and it must be a carnal and devilish reasoning, that sends him to a place of never ending torments—thereby violating God's eternal Justice, wisdom, goodness and mercy.

Here the conversation ended.

A UNIVERSALIST.

Sheshequin, Oct. 3d, 1826.

THE TRANSPORT.

A low, confined growling noise, was heard struggling beneath the deck, and a sailor cried

with a loud voice, "Fire, fire, the ship's on fire!" Holy words died on the prayer's tongue, the congregation fell asunder; and pale faces, wild eyes, groans, shrieks and outcries, rent the silence of the lonesome sea. No one for a while knew the other, as all were hurried as in a whirlwind up and down the ship. A heat, all unlike the warmth of that beautiful sun, came stifling on every breath. Mothers, who in their first terror had shuddered but for themselves, now clasped their infants to their breasts and lifted up their eyes to heaven. Behold, brave men grew white as ashes, and hands strengthened by toil and storm trembled like the aspen leaf. "Gone, gone, we are all gone!" was now the cry, yet no one knew whence that cry came; and men glared reproachfully on each other's countenance, and strove to keep down the audible beatings of their own hearts. The desperate love of life drove them instinctively to their stations, and water was poured, as by the strength of giants, down among the mouldering flames. But the devouring element roared up into the air; and the deck, mast, sail and shrouds, were one cracking and hissing sheet of fire.

"Let down the boat!" was now the yell of hoarse voices, and in an instant she was filled with life. There was a frantic leaping into the sea: and all who were fast drowning moved convulsively towards that little ark. Some sunk down at once to oblivion; some grasped at nothing with their disappearing hands; some seized in vain, unquenched pieces of the wreck; some would have fain saved a friend almost in the last agonies; and some, strong in a savage despair tore from the clenched fingers that would have dragged them down, and forgot in fear both love and pity.

Enveloped in flame and smoke, yet insensible as a corpse to the burning, a frantic mother threw down her babe among the crew; and as it fell among the upward oars unharmed, she shrieked out a prayer of thanksgiving. "Go husband go; for I am content to die! Oh! live, live, my husband for our Willy's sake." But in the prime of life, and with his manly bosom full of health and hope, the husband looked but for a moment till he saw his children were safe and then taking his young wife in his arms, sat down beneath the fragments of the burning sail with the rest that were resigned, never more to rise up till the sound of the last trumpet, where the faithful and the afflicted shall be raised to breath forever empyrean air.

Edinburgh. Lat Gaz.

COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

The amasing author, of 'Hints to my coun-

trymen," gives the following account of John Huss and the council of Constance :

"John Huss was born near Prague, in Bohemia, about the year 1378 ; condemned to death for freedom of discussion in the protestant cause by the council of Constance, in the year 1414, at which were assembled, archbishops and bishops, three hundred and forty-six ; abbots and doctors, five hundred ; earls, knights, esquires, sixteen thousand ; common women, four hundred and fifty ; barbers, six hundred ; musicians, cooks and jesters, three hundred and twenty. A noble assembly indeed ! to condemn an honest man to death for opinion's sake and then to lead him to the slaughter, with a paper cap on his head, painted with the forms of horrid devils, that he might, by foretaste, while life yet lingered, endure the pangs of the infernal regions ! When death had done its office, and there was no visible remnant of the sufferer but his hot ashes, these they gathered up and spread upon the waters of the Rhine."

RIGHTLY SERVED.

"I'm ripe for fun, and up to all sorts of deviltry," said a fellow who went recently to a camp-meeting near Lebanon, determined to have a frolic ; "I'm ripe for fun—I'm hanged if I ain't ! an' if I can get near the wagons, or can finger the harness I guess I'll play a trick on these plaguy methodists. Hallo, Jim ! I tell you what ; I've a sharp knife, and feel as if I'd like to cut up something or other ; now if you will git some of their harness, I vow I'll make short work of it !" Now Jim liked fun as well as any body, and as his croney was about to quiz the methodists, he thought it would be a good time to play a trick on him : so off Jim started, but soon re-appeared with harness and other matters, whereon his comrade might exercise at once his humor and his jack-knife. In a twinkling, the reins &c. were in shreds ; and the jack-knife was about to be closed, when a hearty yaw-haw-haw—rivalling the horse laugh of a Communipaw negro, convulsed the sides of Jim. Suspecting the cause, the hero of the jack-knife ran to his wagon, and found (oh dire mishap !) it was not the harness of a "plaguy methodist," but his own, which he had just cut up.

From the Kilkenny, (Ireland) Independent.

"Thousands of wretches, whom one with very little effort of imagination might mistake for resuscitated skeletons, are to be seen from morning until night, seated on the flags of our public streets, gazing at each other with that vacant and desponding look which bespeaks the extinction of almost every hope."

ANECDOTE.

One of the established ministers of the gospel, happening to be in company with an itinerant preacher, asked the following question : "How does it happen that you have no more doctors of divinity in your connection ?" "Because," said the itinerant, "our divinity is never sick."

Poetry.

A MOTHER'S GRIEF.

A Sketch from Life.

To mark the sufferings of the babe
That cannot speak its woe ;
To see the infant tears gush forth,
Yet know not why they flow ;
To meet the meek uplifted eye,
That fain would ask relief,
Yet can but tell of agony—
This is a mother's grief.

Through dreary days and darker nights,
To trace the march of death ;
To hear the faint and frequent sigh,
The quick and shortened breath ;
To watch the last dread strife draw near,
And pray that struggle brief,
Though all is ended with its close—
This is a mother's grief !

To see in one short hour, decayed
The hope of future years ;
To feel how vain a father's prayers,
How vain a mother's tears ;
To think the gold grave now must close
O'er what was once the chief
Of all the treasured joys of earth—
This is a mother's grief !

Yet, when the first wild throb is past
Of anguish and despair,
To lift the eye of faith to heaven,
And think, "my child is there ;"
This best can dry the gushing tears,
This yields the heart relief ;
Until a christian's pious hope
O'ercomes a mother's grief !

Mr. Doolittle designs to preach in Sheshequin, Bradford co. Pa. on the 29th.

Printed every other Monday, by DIMOCK & FULLER, at \$1 per annum, for C. R. MARSH, Editor, to whom letters and communications postage paid, may be directed.